

# THE LILY

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF WOMAN.

VOL. VII.]

RICHMOND, IND., OCTOBER 1, 1855.

[NO. 18.]

## THE LILY.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY, AT RICHMOND, IND.

Terms—Fifty Cents per annum in advance, or  
Seven Copies for Three Dollars.

All communications designed for the paper or on business, to be addressed to

Mrs. MARY B. BIRDSALL,  
Editor and Proprietor.

Mrs. AMELIA BLOOMER,  
Corresponding Editor.

For the Lily.

The Great Discussion on Woman's Rights!

BETWEEN DR. EQUAL RIGHTS AND REV. MR.

KNOW-IT-ALL, D. D.

REPORTED BY G. W. KNAPP.

Dr. Equal Rights having the affirmative of the question, opened the discussion as follows:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The question we are about to discuss, is one of great import—being no less than that of freeing from bondage one-half the human race. Indeed, I feel so impressed with the magnitude of the subject that I feel totally inadequate to the task of doing it anything like justice; and yet why should I falter? Though of myself weak, armed with the panoply of Truth and Right, why should I fear to look error and wrong boldly in the face?

"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just,  
And he but naked, tho' locked up in steel,  
Whose conscience with injustice is oppressed."

Like all other reforms, it is but to be expected that the claim of woman to equality of rights with man, should be opposed and derided. In this, it but meets the same reception that all new truths receive. Christ was derided as an "infidel" and impostor, and Gallileo, after having been made by persecution to retract his heresy concerning the earth's revolving around the sun, exclaimed, "It does move, though."

And so it is with the political and social world; though conservative, they may pass decrees and edicts declaring that the social and political world stands still, yet for all that, "it does move, tho'." Yes, and is in rapid flight from darkness and barbarism to light and refinement, their anathemas and denunciations no more retard its progress, than the barking and snarling of curs along the road prevents the traveler from reaching his destined goal. Opposition, therefore, my hearers, from this class, proves not that a proposed change is wrong—so far from it, it is prima facie evidence that it is right; for any change that such dogmatical reasoners might propose, might almost infallibly be set down as a veritable humbug.

Opposition we expect, and are ready to meet; we are ever ready to "give a reason for the faith that is in us," and to answer objections. We have not gone so far on the road to infallibility, that we are above argumentation, and simply reason ipse dixit. If the reasons we adduce are not good ones, but fallacious, all we have to say is, go not with us. If we are but "blind leaders of the

blind," leave us "alone in our glory," and keep yourselves from falling into the ditch, too. But if our arguments are good—if we show you that this is a "more excellent way," ye cannot consistently tarry in Jericho for your beards to grow and become like other people, but should come out and "face the music" with "shaven chins," among "bearded brethren."

But here is too often the difficulty: The Jew would tarry six months in Jericho for his beard to grow, sooner than present himself to his brethren with shaven chin. So it is with people at the present day in matters of reform; they are afraid to stem the tide of popular ridicule, and advocate their honest convictions. They will wear false beards or tarry in Jericho, out of sight, till other people shave themselves, too, before they have courage to let their convictions be known. But let us come to the question: "Have women equal rights with men? I answer yes; and will endeavor to show you why.

In the first place, let us inquire into the origin of rights. We have a right to the sunlight of heaven, to air, to food, to drink. Why? It is simply that our organization is such that we need them to perpetuate our existence. We have a right to the light of heaven, because it is necessary to give us vigor and elasticity: without it, we should become like plants that grow in the dark, destitute of color and endurance. We have a right to air, because it is necessary to our existence; without it to regenerate the blood and keep up the fires in the system, life would soon become extinct. And so it is with food and water. They are necessary to our existence and comfort, and happiness, and consequently, we have a right to them; for our rights are co-extensive with our wants and grow out of them. With food and other things that are not of spontaneous production, the right is to that from which they can be produced as to the earth, &c., enough to produce the requisite amount.

Our wants, then, are the basis of our rights; and consequently whatever we want or need to promote our happiness and enjoyment, and have a natural and inherent right.

This being the broad foundation on which we stand, we boldly say that woman's rights are co-extensive with man's; for she has the same organization, with the same wants and requirements, and consequently the same rights. She is a physical being, with physical wants, and consequently has the same right to the means to supply those wants that man has. She is an intellectual being, with intellectual wants and inclinations, and consequently has the same right to the means of their gratification with man. She is a social and moral being, and consequently has an equal right with him to the means of their gratification.

Abstractly considered, perhaps no one will question the truth of any of the above propositions; and yet they cover the whole ground. Out of her physical, intellectual, social and moral natures, and their wants and requirements, grow all the rights in which she requires and asks protection or security. Secure these to her in the same manner in which they are secured to man, and her clamors will cease. These propositions are my foundation! If it is a sandy one, and not the sol-

id rock of Truth, I trust the Rev. Mr. Know-it-All will pour out such a deluge of argument as to completely undermine my castle, and let it tumble over.

Before I yield the floor to my learned opponent, I will simply state my argument, so that in answering it, he may not misapprehend the point at issue, and "darken counsel by words without knowledge," by "talking as one that beateth the air." It is that our rights grow out of our wants and needs. That whatever we want or need to promote our happiness and enjoyment, we have a right to, or to the means to produce which, where it is not of spontaneous production. That woman, being constituted with an organization the same as man's, with the same wants and needs, that she has a right to the same means to satisfy these wants and needs that man has.

Here the Dr. concluded, and the Rev. gentleman proceeded very pompously to answer him in the following strain:

"Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am truly surprised at the Doctor's method of argumentation! What can he expect to prove by prating about wants begetting rights, &c. That may be all well enough in its place, but what has it to do with the question? If it has anything to do with it, he certainly has given no practical application to the principle he seeks to establish. His talk is as vague as the ravings of a maniac! His propositions are all correct for what I can see, but what have they to do with the subject of woman's voting? That was the subject we were to discuss, and yet he has not even mentioned it! Does he think he can distract my attention, and be permitted to dodge the question entirely? He'll find he's got the wrong customer to deal with this time; it is just as I expected, a lot of ranting nonsense in support of chimerical notions, from a moon-struck brain! Well, I had hoped to have met something worthy of my steel, but as yet I have nothing to fire at. He is bound to make out his case, being in the affirmative, so that I should have the question were I to say nothing. But I will try at least to be generous, and not ask so much, but will prove the negative to the right side of the question, that women have not equal rights with men.

For this I have a "thus saith the Lord;" I do not rely upon such broken reeds as simple reason. "He shall rule over thee." This is my stronghold; this admits of no doubt. Here is no foggy reasoning—it is a simple command, a decree of the Almighty. The woman became deceived and fell, and this was the consequence. In vain may she attempt the penalty of her crime. The edict has gone forth, and who shall stand before the words of Jehovah? What though puny Reason should demonstrate that this decreases wrong? Even that were as stubble in the breath of the Almighty! His nostrils will consume it as flax! Naught can stand before Him! He speaks and the mountains quake, and bow themselves to do Him homage! Then what can the puny reason of man do when measuring strength with Omnipotence. His word scattereth it as fog fleeth before the morning sun!

It is strange, indeed, that the world has went on this six thousand years, and it has been just dis-



covered that women are entitled to vote! Why, if it is so plain as they pretend, was it not discovered before? Why didn't Solomon and John, and a thousand other wise legislators and philosophers discover it. True, Plato contended for something similar, but he was but a heathen, and it is a sufficient refutation of his doctrines that he contended that women should wrestle the same as did the men! Even his pupils, Aristotle, Xenophon and others, showed the error of their master, and that the true sphere of woman was in the domestic circle, over which she presides as the queen does over the bees of a hive.

The world is getting wonderful wise all at once! Why didn't St. Paul tell us about woman's enfranchisement, instead of "Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord." Eph. v. 22. Brought up as he was at the feet of Gamaliel, strange that his mind was less piercing than those of our modern fanatics! And so it is with all the writers of the Bible. Peter commands wives to be in subjection to their own husbands. Peter III. 1. Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, *nor to usurp authority over the man*, but to be in silence; for Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression. (I. Tim. II. 11 to 14.) Is not this enough? Were it necessary, we could "pile Pelian upon Ossa;" but the cumulative force of the argument is irresistible. It cannot be doubted that it is the doctrine of the scriptures that woman should be in subjection to man. From Genesis to Revelations it teems with texts too direct and unequivocal to admit of a doubt.

And then it is so becoming in woman, weak and fragile creature as she is, to depend upon man for support and protection! Constructed of one of his ribs, truly the place from which she was taken is a beautiful poetic emblem—an argument, I might say—a typical representation showing that her true place is under man's arm for protection! What more true symbol of her sphere could be imagined? Truly does she look to man for protection; it is her nature—she leans upon his strong arm, and is safe and free from all danger and contamination. There is nothing now to seduce her from her domestic duties and vocations. But open to her an avenue to office and preferment, and she will neglect her home duties, and be gadding around the neighborhood, talking politics, and leave her affairs to run to waste.

No, no! it will never do. I tell you woman is now in her true sphere. Change it, and you unhinge society. It will divide families, and spread anarchy and confusion. Instead of being bound together in one bundle of love and harmony, discord and contention will reign around the domestic hearth! Woman, soon, instead of being the sweet and loving creature she now is, would be transformed into a vixen; her children would be forgotten and left to the care of the father, growing up like beasts! No, no! this will never do! I implore you, friends, frown down this monster doctrine! It is as pestilential as the poison of the Upas tree; as deadly as the Simoon of the Desert. It will sap the foundations of society, and bring a relapse of the "Dark Ages!" It is one of the foul plots concocted in Pandemonium to stay the spread of Christianity, and bring the world again under the dominion of Satan! Heed not the machinations of the enemy, but cry to his disciples "Get thee behind me, Satan." Give no heed to their wily arguments; if it were possible, they would deceive even Omniscience!

With this rhapsody of denunciation and invective, the Rev. gentleman retired from the floor amid a great uproar of faint cheering, drowned by a tornado of hisses. During the Rev. gentleman's onslaught, the Doctor appeared to be the most calm of any of the audience: and when the floor was clear, took it promptly and replied:

"Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The vehemence and arrogance of the Rev. gentleman's concluding remarks, reminds me of an anecdote that very clearly illustrates his position: 'A man being troubled by a deer which committed depredations in his corn-field, took his dog and gun, and Cuffy, to go out and exterminate the pest. He stationed Cuffy, with the gun, on the runway, to

kill the deer when it came along, and went with the dog to drive him round. Soon the deer came bounding along at a fearful rate, but Cuffy instead of shooting, gazed and let him pass without firing. The master presently made his appearance, and asked if he had shot the deer. 'No,' Cuffy, replied, 'Why, didn't you, you black rascal,' thundered the master; 'O! let him alone, *he jump herself to death.*'"

So it might be said of the Rev. gentleman's remarks, "*let himself alone, he'll jump herself to death!*" Truth requires no such violent exertions to establish its claims. Cool, calm arguments are its weapons; it doesn't kill itself with kicking to show that it is alive.

"One single moment of deliberate thought  
And cloudless reason would have spared him"

all the vehemence of his declamation, which, if there was any life in his argument, has been extinguished by the violence of their delivery. It is an old and true proverb that Truth often suffers more from the heat of its defenders than arguments of its opposers:

"Fit words attend on weighty sense,  
And mild persuasion flows in eloquence."

But let us take a look after his arguments, and reply. It appears to surprise the Rev. gentleman very much to think that it has just been discovered that woman has a right to vote. He wonders why St. Paul didn't tell her of it, instead of commanding wives to submit to their husbands, &c.

I will tell the Rev. gentleman why he did not, on one condition: he must first tell me why St. Paul didn't tell *men* that they had a right to govern themselves, instead of commanding them to "obey them that have rule over you." Heb. xiii. 17. "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates." Titus iii. 1. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God! the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinances of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." Rom. xiii. 1, 2. "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, &c. Honor the king." Peter ii. 13, 17. Certainly, government by the people must be a mistaken idea, or St. Paul and Peter would have told us of it, instead of the reverse! They as much commanded obedience to kings and emperors, as they do woman's obedience to man. If one has gone by the board, why may not the other also? If man may lean upon himself, and not obey the mandates of kings and emperors, why may not woman lean upon herself instead of on man? Surely she is but following the example set by man in his disobedience to the command of these Apostles.

The only shadow of a reason that is given for their commands to wives is, that man was "first formed, and that Eve was deceived, while Adam was not," when each eat of the forbidden fruit! Two very profound reasons, truly! According to the argument of the priority of creation, the beasts and fishes and fowls are more glorious than even man, for they were "*first formed!*" And according to the other argument, the deliberate, willful transgressor is a suitable subject to be a ruler over those who have too much conscience to sin without being deceived!! Such arguments are like the gun mentioned by Hudibras, which would

"Whether aimed at duck or plover,  
Rebound and kick its owner over."

Each and every one of the arguments that are crowded into the service of making the woman's subject to the man, is only one of the hydra-heads of Prejudice rearing itself in some other form, and which would exclaim, had it a tongue:

"—In me is all the bar  
Which thou would'st fain remove."

With such it is useless to argue; their hearts are of adamant—steeped against conviction. The arrows of truth glance from their sides as the dart of the African over the impenetrable coat of the crocodile. With arguments

"Frail as a gossamer, whose fibres span  
From shrub to shrub, which lightest zephyrs fan  
Away!

They beat back opposers, and consider them dumb-founded and speechless.

"Against experience they believe!  
Argue against demonstration;  
Pleased when their reason they deceive,  
And set their judgment by their passion;  
I every point to make it fit,  
They force all nature to submit."

As to his poetical symbol of woman's being in her proper sphere, while depending on the arm of man for protection, because she was made of his ribs, I would simply say that man, having been made of clay, and taken from the ground, is a very conclusive argument that the drunkard, while rolling in the gutter, is in the proper sphere of man; for, forsooth, wasn't he taken from there? Rich logic such! However, it does very well to hang a "forlorn hope" upon, for those who have no better arguments to adduce. Some people have very exuberant imaginations, and deal in exquisite imagery, when one would expect to hear sound argument. When all respectable arguments are gone, then in a tone

"As yet more gay,  
Fire off the next idea in their array;  
The dry fag-ends of every obvious doubt,  
And puff and blow for fear they should go out."

A very fascinating way, it may be, of diverting attention from the true point at issue, by charming the listeners into ecstasies, yet while discussing a subject of as vast magnitude as the one before us, I prefer to deal in arguments instead of phantasies of the brain.

But it is, "He shall rule over thee," that he takes shelter behind. This is his stronghold—his castle—to this he trusts for protection. If the Bible said that trees grew with their roots in the air, the fact that they do not, would be no argument against it, for it is in the Bible. Reason, the Rev. gentleman perfectly contemns; indeed, it appears the English language cannot furnish him with words sufficiently disparaging to express his contempt of it. And yet, I should be pleased to know how he can show or know that this same book from which he quotes, is worth the value of a straw as proof, without entirely depending upon that same reason to determine the value of the proof brought to support its claims? If reason is sufficiently clear-sighted and conclusive in its proofs, to establish the authenticity of the Word of God, pray is it not of sufficient value to enable us to interpret and construe its various parts, when the literal reading brings it in contradiction with reason? And what is this same reason, too, but the arrangement and relation and dependence of one thing upon another, which the Almighty has given the constitution of things? In short, what is Reason but the word of God written in the constitution of things? Then where is the sense, the pertinency, of his sneering allusion to it? If what the Almighty has written with his own hand cannot be depended upon for a guide, pray how much dependence can be put upon that other Revelation with which ignorant and fallible men has had so much to do? Considering these things, and how Scripture is tortured into the support of oppression, with Shakspeare I am ready to exclaim,

"In religion  
What error, but some sober brow  
Will bless it and approve it with a text."

And I will here remark that those who find anything to countenance the subjection of woman to man in the Scriptures, find only reflected there a shadow of their own minds. And what makes them so in love with it is, *it is so like themselves.* They are like the owl in Perrin's fable, that fell in love with its own beauty.

But let us look around his castle, and see what we can do towards pulling it down.

In the first place, this was the result and consequence of the "fall." Before this, she was on an equality with man. There was no "ruling over" each other then; the governing power was mutually vested in each. The "fall" plunged them into barbarism and depravity; and certainly while in that state, the penalty has been most wofully endured. She has been ruled over with a rod of iron. Look among savage nations—a veritable beast of burden! Glorious news to savages, the notion that man shall rule over woman! How wonderfully it preposesses them in favor of the Christian religion! It chimes with their notion of theology exactly—that brute force should bear sway—that might makes right—that the strong should tyrannize and rule over the weak to save themselves from labor!



Their claim that man shall rule over woman being based on the ground of the "fall," it necessarily follows that regeneration must completely do away the objection against her co-equality with man, in a scriptural point of view, and remove his right to rule over her. When she is renewed in the image of her Maker, she is restored to her original purity, as she was in the garden of Eden, and consequently restored to her lost position.

It is somewhat strange that they claim the "fall" gave the man a right to rule over the woman; he fell as much as she, then why not make her a ruler over him? for it cannot possibly be construed so as to make it that she was more culpable than he. But this is one of those questions which are much more easily asked than answered. Yet, as I view it, the "Fall," as a natural consequence, plunged them into barbarism and depravity—a state in which the brute force is the governing power—consequently, woman being the weaker of the two, was made the slave of man. The curse, so-called, pronounced upon her, was no anathema, no vindictive, vengeful decree, but simply a declaration of the penalties attached to the violation of laws, whose transgression would sink them into degradation. And that it was but the natural and inevitable consequence of violating these laws, that she has been and will be ruled over by him, until, by the process of civilization and refinement, mankind become so elevated that moral supercedes brute force as the governing power.

Viewed prophetically, it has been realized to the fullest extent. No one could wish to have a prophecy more completely fulfilled. The veriest skeptic would be satisfied with such a fulfilment.

But to confine ourselves to the text: The words are spoken to Eve, "And he shall rule over thee." By what system of philology can this be made to extend to the present time? Not a word is said about her posterity—nothing of extending the penalty to them.

In regard to the enmity between the woman and the serpent, it is expressly extended to the "seed" of each. In the penalty passed upon the woman, if it was to extend to her posterity, why was it not mentioned, as in the verse immediately preceding it? Certainly a subject of as vast importance as this—the enfranchisement of one-half the human race—is of too vast importance to leave to implication. If all women were to be ruled over by men, was it not of as much importance that the command should be explicit, as it was in the case of the enmity between the seed of the serpent and woman? Does the Almighty do his business in such a loose and slipshod manner as this? Does he ordain bondage for one half the human race, and leave it to be presumed from the connection of the passage?

But it may be said that "in Adam all died," and consequently that this extends it to future generations. In reply, it can also be said that "as in Adam all died, even so in Christ all are made alive," thus placing them on precisely the same footing they were before the fall. And as, according to their theory, man's ruling over woman was one of the direct faults and penalties consequent upon the fall; and as it can be plainly shown that the consequences of the fall have been removed by Christ, as it can that the curse of being ruled over by man was to extend to the women of future generations; and, indeed, by the same passage it is perfectly clear that in this respect they bear the same relation to each other they did before the fall—that of mental government—consequently, that man has no right from scripture authority concerning the Fall to rule over woman. In the present case, there cannot but at least be a doubt as to whether the curse of being ruled over by man, or was to extend to the females of future generations, and according to the custom of giving those to be tried the benefit of the doubt, the verdict must be rendered in favor of woman. The most authoritative of any thing are the commands of the Apostles, which have been already disposed of.

The only rational way of explaining the "fall" and its consequences, is as I have already done, to give it a natural solution. As a consequence of the barbarism and depravity into which man has been sunk, making brute force the governing power, the weak being a prey of the strong, woman

being the weaker vessel, as a natural consequence has been ruled over by man—and will continue to be so until brute force is superceded by moral influence—or until mankind become intelligent, virtuous and refined. Then mankind will not crave power, and wish to rule over others, but will have grown wise enough to know that at their best estate, they have as much as they can do to consistently rule themselves and protect their own rights, without hunting up subjects upon which to exercise their superfluous superlative ruling powers. Then men will know that even woman can tell her own wants and rights better than others can do it for her, however transcendent their talents may be. After all, the only way to determine the question is to appeal to the light of Reason and Experience. Scripture, at the most, only professes to give us correct views and commands in regard to religion and the plainest axioms in morals. Physical philosophy and political science, it treats of only incidentally; and then it speaks of them according to the condition and positions in which they then stood. It spoke of the earth's standing still, and the sun's revolving round it; so it was then understood. It speaks of man's ruling over woman, not that it was the absolutely true science of government, but as being the then adopted system, the same as it alluded to the immobility of the earth, and commanded people to be subject to kings and emperors. It is full as much a command in one instance as the other, and consequently, if one is not binding, by a parity of reasoning the other is not, also.

Let us return, then, to the true method of argumentation, Reason and Experience, and leave the passages in Scripture that treat upon the subject to accommodate themselves to the methods of government they may adopt, the same as the Scripture doctrine that the earth was the centre as the sun moved around it, has accommodated its If to the Copernican system of Astronomy—for certainly man is no more the centre of the political system than the earth is of the solar—the Bible being a guide in one case no more than in the other.

Then, with all due deference to the Rev. gentleman, we must say that we have carefully examined his impregnable castle, and found it a very flimsy affair. True, it was undoubtedly tenable in the times in which it was built, and proof against the missiles then used in warfare; for in those days might was right—brute force being the governing power; but he should know that the art of warfare has been much improved within the last few thousand years. A bombshell of one fact that justice is not dealt out to woman by man, is sufficient to blow the whole fabric to atoms.

We will trust the direful consequences of elevating woman to a political and intellectual equality with man, that the Rev. Gentleman tells us of.—"Let justice be done though the heavens fall!" He tells us that it will debase woman, and cause her to neglect her other duties, the education of her children, &c., to allow her equal rights with man.

But a few years ago, and even in the most of Europe at the present time, it was considered the duty and true sphere of the mass of men to delve, delve, and be governed by the ruling class; and that to allow them a voice in governmental affairs would distract their attention, and cause them to neglect and disqualify them for the discharge of their true duties—delving. But we see in this country and others where the people have a voice in the government, that so far from its causing them to neglect or disqualifying them for the discharge of their other duties, it has actually increased their capacities, and made them more skilful in the management of their private affairs.—And so it would undoubtedly be with woman.—Admitted to the elective franchise, she would as a matter of necessity become at least somewhat versed in political and governmental affairs, and the science of government, and thus becoming acquainted with the rights and duties of citizens, she would be much better qualified to rear up her children to become useful members of society, and imbue them with the true philosophy of life.—Were she to devote herself exclusively to politics, literature, or any thing else, it is true it must be done at the expense and neglect of other things. Yet I doubt very much whether it is any more

pardonable for a Poe or other masculine literati or politician, to neglect to provide for their families because engaged in literary pursuits, than it was for Mary Wolstoncraft to hand water to a gentleman in a broken tea-cup, and give the same excuse. But the great difficulty is, these sticklers for old forms fails to perceive the beam in their own eye, while the mote in their sister's eye is very plainly discernable. The poet has not unaptly sung,

"—The nature of mankind is such,  
To see and judge the affairs of others  
Much better than their own,"

And whether he had an eye to this class or variety of the genus homo or not, or was totally ignorant of their existence, I leave my hearers to determine.

In reply to the objection that it will debase woman to mingle in politics, little need be said.—Were she to mingle in the bar-room crowd, on election days, no doubt it would; and the same is true of the mass of men. To mingle in such scenes would debase two-thirds of the whole masculine gender—all but those sunk to the lowest depths of depravity and those few so pure and refined that they have no more affinity for the loathsome contagion, and from whom it rolls as oil off of water. Then carry out the principles of reasoning—all but these few should be disfranchised, for, forsooth, attending election debases them.—This method of reasoning would effectually disfranchise more males than females; for two-thirds of our females would be so thoroughly disgusted with what they came in contact that it would only make them strive the harder to wipe off the dark spot from the face of humanity. And undoubtedly her presence on election days would so far change the face of affairs that instead of being contaminated and debased herself, she would have a refining, elevating influence upon those with whom she came in contact. It is a lamentable fact that the political arena is a sink of corruption, and nothing could have a more healthful and sanitary influence than the presence of woman. So far from its having any injurious and baneful effect upon society to disfranchise woman, the presumption is strong the other way—that it would vastly purify and refine the political atmosphere, and society at large; for it is well known that woman's moral nature is much more developed than man's, and that men are naturally attracted to virtue, while

"Vice is a monster of such hideous mien,  
As to be hated, needs but to be seen."

One thing is certain, that men are not more debased in countries where they are enfranchised than where they are not, and the presumption is, that instead of woman's being contaminated and debased, it would be

"Even as if an angel shook his wings—  
Immortal fragrance fills the circuit wide."

He has not denied but admitted the correctness of my arguments or propositions, that our wants and rights are co-extensive—the former being parent of and begetting the latter. He complains, however, that I gave no practical application of the principle, and contends that it was inadvertent or irrelevant to the question. That I did not make any application of this principle, I admit, but I omitted it intentionally. I knew that he would deny any principle, even though self-evident, that sanctioned the doctrine I advocate. I preferred to have him examine the foundation and judge of its solidity before he had seen what kind of a superstructure it was capable of supporting. This he has done; he can discover no flaw, or vein of sand underlying or permeating its parts. What additional keenness his intellectual optics may acquire when he discovers an equal-rights castle erected thereon, I leave for time to determine.—He doubtless will, so far distrust its lease that he will hardly venture within its walls. However, "we shall see what we shall see."

Let us now apply our principle: Woman has the same organization that man has, and consequently the same need of food, raiment, &c., and the principle being true, the same right to them. But these the laws do not secure to her. They are very partial, the person of the wife being in the custody of the husband. They secure him her earnings, leaving her entirely dependent upon him for support, instead of securing her her rights.—



She has not even the control of her own person, but is subject to his commands, as much as the veriest slave; and to enforce which the law allows him to use "gentle chastisement." She has nothing of her own; the law secures her nothing; her children are at the disposal of the husband, and at his death she may have the use of one-third of their mutual estate. Should she die, the case is very different. He has the absolute control of the whole. These are but a moiety of the beauties which the law metes out to woman. True, in some States, the rougher asperities of the laws have been ameliorated, but nothing like justice has yet been secured to her; or will be until she has a voice in determining who shall make the laws by which she must abide.

Here we see that her wants are not provided for, and consequently, that her rights are not secured; what she has is by the *sufferance of the husband*, and not secured by *right*. She is treated as a nonentity, an idiot, or child—as being incapable of knowing or providing for her own wants, this being left to be done proxically by her husband. Here we have the pertinency of our argument, that instead of securing woman her wants and needs, the law leaves it optional with another to grant her demands or not, and to be the judge of what she does not want. Here we have the grand secret of why woman requires the right to vote, to be enfranchised—that her rights may be secured to her, that she can have her wants supplied by *right* and not by *sufferance*.

But the Rev. gentleman tells us that this would lead to monarchy and discord; that instead of families being bound together in one bundle of love, there would be family broils and contentions. Let us analyze his argument. "It would lead to discord." Where? In families where the husband considered his wife an equal and "help-meet" and treated her as having equal rights with himself? No; for there would be nothing to contend about—there she would claim no more than her husband would be ready and willing to grant. Then where would this discord be? It must be where the husband wished to be a tyrant and make a slave of his wife; here is the only chance for it to arise. Here, if the wife claims her rights, discord and contention will arise: yes, it undoubtedly will, for who ever knew a tyrant to peaceably resign his way?

But what is to be the price of the peace and love and harmony he tells us of? Why, simply the slavery—the meek and quiet submission of the wife to the tyrant! Beautiful love and harmony here! Love and harmony purchased by immolating women on the altar of masculine tyranny!—Give us the anarchy and discord and contention in preference to this. Peace purchased at such a price as this would be far, far "too dear a whistle."

No tyrant ever gave up his sway without compulsion; neither do we expect it here. The selfish will hold on to their rod to the last gasp; the only way is to throttle the giant Might, and wrench his ego from his hand. He that expects him to give it up willingly, betrays a lamentable ignorance of human nature. Quietists may cry "peace, peace, but there is no peace;" the only way is to come up "through great tribulation."

Simple shouting and blowing of trumpets caused the walls of Jericho to fall, but the days of such things are past. The fight between Right and Wrong, and Truth and Error, is an earnest hand-to-hand fight. Every inch of ground must be won by main force—nothing is yielded up gratuitously. Despotism never proves treacherous to itself, and surrenders without a desperate conflict. His strong-holds must be besieged longer than Troy, even for centuries, before they can be taken.

But there is another old and stale objection to which the Rev. gentleman has alluded. When summed up, it amounts to a charge that the women wish to change places with the men, and take the rule into their own hands; and many has been the tirade upon woman's rights founded upon the ridiculousness of a man's taking charge of a babe, while the wife was managing the farm, or off to Congress. But this you are well aware is only sheer misrepresentation. Woman does not wish to change spheres with man; not to take upon her-

self the sole government. The latter she is willing to mutually share with man; and she claims her sphere or orbit to be wherever her natural qualifications and circumstances capacitate her to move—to hoe corn, dig potatoes, go to Congress, or even—

"Pluck bright honors from the pale-faced moon,  
Or diving into the bottom of the deep,  
Where fathom line could never touch the ground,  
And drag up drowned honor by the locks."

All she is willing to share with man. She asks for no monopolizing power to be placed in her hands. She claims as her right, equality with man. But with man it is far different. He wishes to treat her as an inferior being, as being created for him, and not as their being-created mutually for each other. Like the toad in the fable, to show how big he is, he swells up and bursts himself, without convincing the mass of mankind that that quality which enables people to "swell" so largely, is a very essential ingredient in the composition of astute legislators.

"Urged with a thousand proofs he stands unmoved,  
Fast by himself, and scorns to be out-proved."

And when he is hard pressed for argument, he appeals to the people to frown down the "monstrous doctrines" he cannot refute, trusting, it is to be presumed, that

"The end will atone the means."

The Rev. Gentleman took the floor, and after humming and coughing several times to dissipate the fog that had settled over his ideas, proceeded:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, truly a world of words we have heard. The Dr. has surely fathomed the depths of verbosity, thinking perhaps to gain the subject by piling over it logonichal mountain. But I trust, my hearers have sufficient perception to discover that pompous sounds are not always arguments; that he has brought forth a wonderful gust of wind for so little rain. Trusting to your good sense, I shall not attempt to go over the whole field he has surveyed, to point out the subtle sophistry of his arguments, the rashness of his assumptions, or the fallacies of his conclusions. These, you can readily perceive for yourselves, and have undoubtedly already weighed them in the balance and found them wanting. And yet, there are some things so specious, and others so ranting and objectionable that I cannot pass over them in silence.

The claims that because woman has the same wants as man, that she consequently has the same rights, and among others right of voting. This last I deny. He says that she must have this right to secure her adequate protection in person and property. But cannot laws be made by legislators to protect these without her having a voice in electing those legislators to office? Most certainly they can. Daughters now inherit the same as sons, showing that justice can be done to women without her having a voice in elections, or being enfranchised. So you see all his talk is about a mere abstraction, a chimera of the brain that amounts to nothing. Justice can just as well be secured to woman without her voting as with. They are grasping after a bubble; like children chasing butterflies, running after that which they cannot catch, or which is useless when caught; and this at the expense of duties in her true sphere—and from which she does not wish to be removed. They, the mass of women I mean, are satisfied, contented, say they have 'rights enough.' It is only aspiring ones, 'strong-minded' Amazons who wish to unsex themselves by dabbling in the dirty puddle of politics. They, unable to obtain notoriety in a legitimate and honorable way, in woman's true sphere, by being meek and quiet wives, have concluded, like the Courtesan Thais, who besought Alexander to allow her to burn the palace of Xerxes, to try to become notorious in the annals of Fame, even of the halo that surrounds their brow, should be the questionable one of infamy—the phosphorescent light of a decaying body. Well, they are welcome to it; let the noise of their clamor be heralded from one end of the earth to the other; their race is short, and soon they will pass away and become a laughing-stock and by-word for future generations; warning and example to others to bid them flee from the path that leads to the land of delusions. Because a few dozen can be found who boldly proclaim political equality with man, no more proves

it is right, than because as many maniacs can be found on any other subject, proves their wild notions are sound sense. It is nothing more than might be expected; if people cannot go crazy on one subject, they will on another; but the world has gone quietly on its way notwithstanding their rantings, and I am strongly inclined to think that the political world will hardly alter its orbit to correspond with these visionary notions of what it ought to be. The fact that the mass of women acquiesce in the present state of things, is sufficient proof that they are satisfied with their present condition, and do not desire to be enfranchised.

The idea that woman must vote in order to have her rights secure is preposterous. Man is woman's natural protector, and as such, votes for her, and sees to making laws for her protection.—She relies upon him; and here is her only security. Her weak and helpless condition, entire dependence on him, are a more effectual guaranty that her wants will be abundantly supplied than all the laws forty volumes of statute books could contain. Were she to claim the supply of her wants by *right*, what chance would she stand against his giant powers? With perfect ease he could strip her of her all. Subjection and dependence upon man is her natural and appropriate sphere. In nothing is the wisdom, benevolence and skill of the Almighty, exhibited so much as in this adapting her this peculiar situation. It is the greatest favor that could be conferred upon her, vastly better than to have made her to have coped with man for her supplies, and depended upon herself for protection.

I come now to glance at his attempt to undermine my castle, and explain away a 'thus saith the Lord.' His special pleading is very much like the lawyer's, who was defending a client that had been sued for damaging a borrowed article. The first plea was that the article was returned in a sound condition. The second was that it was damaged when borrowed. And the third one, that he never borrowed it at all. He at first, attempts to show that the curse of being ruled over by man was not to extend to the females of future generations. Next, that the passage is prophetic, and has been already fulfilled. Then, that in Christ the effects of the Fall are removed. And finally, that, if nothing will do, he proposes to trust to simple, flimsy reason to interpret the important passage. To me the passage is perfectly unequivocal, clear and conclusive. I ask no aid from reason to help me interpret, and he shall rule over thee.' It means nothing more or less than that woman shall be subject to man, and that to the latest generations. In accordance with this, St. Paul commands 'wives to submit to their husbands.' This special pleading to do away the passage, needs no exposure from me; it is such a bundle of transparent sophistry, that, as it were, a blind person can at once see through it.

It was the consequence of the fall; the curse pronounced upon her by her Maker, for eating of the forbidden fruit. It is but a just penalty meted out as the reward of her heinous crime, and it needs no subterfuge to explain it away, no tergiversation to get round it. The acuteness of the Doctor in turning sharp corners, is truly remarkable; his plausible sophistry would almost persuade one that white was black, and black white; in short, to disbelieve their own senses. The distinction between the nature of the sexes he very adroitly keeps out of sight, and reasons as if they were precisely alike—as if man was not the head and woman the heart of society. And yet this is certainly in a great degree the case. Woman has much more affection than man, while man is more intelligent. Here is the secret why man should rule over her. It is because he can see more clearly than she; it is man's superior wisdom that entitles him to the supremacy, thereby securing adequate means to accomplish the proper ends.—Truly hath the poet said,

"The wise are circumspect, maturely weigh  
The consequence of what they undertake,  
Good ends propose, and fittest means apply  
To accomplish their designs."

Woman is governed too much by her affections, her heart, to be entrusted with the governing power. She is too tender hearted; would lack the requisite decision, force, and indomitableness to be



a legislator; her compassion would lead her to be lenient in prescribing punishment for crimes, and for want of adequate restraints mankind would become riotous, licentious, dissipated, profligate and vicious. Solomon has well said, that he that spares the rod spoils the child. Place woman with these feminine weaknesses at the helm of Government, and crime and vice would run rampant through the land. No; no, it would never do! to 'act like a woman,' is a by-word for chicken-heartedness. We want none such to guard the morals of and destinies of the country. Stern, indomitable resolution is what is wanted; no swerving when inexorable Justice asks for its recompense. Then, dispensers of justice should forget that they have hearts, that the criminal or culprit is their brother. For this reason the ancients pictured Justice as blind, that he might weigh out exact justice to all without regard to aught besides. It is a true maxim that justice should be done though the heavens fall; yet with woman to deal it out, methinks, it would be meted out in Homeopathic doses.

The Doctor has attempted to throw sand into your eyes, and make you believe that it is no worse for a woman to neglect her duties for politics than for man, and refers to Poe and Mary Wolstoncraft. How the case of either can illustrate his position, I am at a loss to perceive. Poe neglected to provide for his family and his wife died broken-hearted, because he was dissipated, and not because he was engaged in literary pursuits or politics. Such egregious ignorance in one who attempts to palm himself off as capable of expounding political philosophy and the science of government, is truly astonishing! His facts and reasoning are both off of the same piece. Drunkenness, literature, politics, all one; drawing conclusions, that because a man neglects to provide for his family, owing to dissipation, a woman has a right to neglect her household affairs to dabble in the dirty puddle of politics! Rich logic, such! Well, it is just what might be expected from such

'Philosophers, who find  
Some favorite system to their mind.'  
'The clear harangue, and cold as it is clear,  
Falls sophorific on the listless ear;  
Like quicksilver, the rhetoric they display  
Shines as it runs, but, grasped at, slips away.'

The Doctor, in reply, spoke as follows:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The Rev. gentleman's dictatorial presumptuous manner, if not his arguments, have undoubtedly convinced you that he has the right side of the question, but as I told you before, I have not arrived so near Infallibility as to be able to reason in the same manner, I have to get at my conclusions, climbing up, step by step, till I reach the top. With him it is different, he gives one swoop with his powerful pinions, and he is on the summit—at the conclusions; and this is all you see of his argument, upon what foundation it stands he deigns not to tell; he simply asserts that it is *sound*, and that is all you can get. Seeing that he has left us in the dark upon this point, we shall have to dig around the foundation and see upon what it stands, for ourselves.

He first tells us that laws *can* be made that will secure the right of women, without their voting for the legislators that make them; and cites an instance to prove it. Most certainly they can; but the question is, *will* they be made? Laws can be made by absolute monarchs to protect the rights of men, and many such *have* been made.—Does this prove that monarchs *will* effectually protect the rights of their subjects? Far from it; the fact is that so long as those who made the laws were not under the control of the people, their rights were not protected. Until they were enfranchised, they bore the oppressor's yoke. And so it is with woman. Until legislators are made dependent upon her equally with man, her rights will not be equally protected with his. What *can* be done, and *will* be done, are two things widely different, and as far apart as light and darkness.—One would naturally suppose that the Rev. Gentleman was a successful imitator; if nothing more, of transparent fallacies, or bungling sophisms.—So you see that what woman is contending for, is not so visionary and intangible an object after all. She wishes to have what is so that it now *can* be done, fixed so that it *must* be done; and in no way

can this be secured but by the enfranchisement of woman. Talk about selfish man making laws that will secure the equal rights of woman! the idea is preposterous!

They guard but to fleece,  
As foxes protect the turkeys and geese.

If men are so willing that exact justice should be meted out to woman, why do they so strenuously object to her having a voice in the making of the laws? It is not the liberal and just that raise the objections and oppose it the most, but the selfish and designing, who wish to prey upon her. The votes of men protect women just as much as woman's eating would satisfy man's appetite and no more.

The fact that the mass of women acquiesce in the present state of things, only proves that they know not how little is actually *secured* to them by our laws. Were man to treat her as the laws would allow, not one in a thousand would own that they had rights enough. It is only because the customs of society are so far in advance of the laws, that deludes her with the conclusion that she is secure. Occasional instances occur where man chooses to use the power the law places in his hands, which causes society to raise its voice of indignation. But that does not help the case: it is not the remedy—the just and equal rights of woman secured to her by *law* alone can reach the case. It is useless to expect this by sufferance from *all* men. Some wives undoubtedly have more than even the law could secure them. But it is not for the benefit of these that the laws are made; it is to protect them against the *bad*, such as are not a law unto themselves.

At one minute the Rev. gentleman tells us that the Almighty has displayed the greatest benevolence and skill in adapting woman to her present condition, and that it is vastly superior to what it would have been had she been placed on an equality with man, and at the next he tells us that this was the curse pronounced upon her for eating the forbidden fruit, the just penalty and award of her crimes. Truly, "consistency thou art a jewel!"—Hot and cold with the same breath—the same thing both a curse and blessing! This is a rather rich development of principle; but it makes no difference with him. According to his reasoning, for her to be ruled over by man, is a blessing to her, but according to his theology, it is a curse pronounced upon her for eating the forbidden fruit, both of which I consider erroneous conclusions. My reason tells me that it is a curse for her to be ruled over by man, but according to my theology, no such curse was ever pronounced upon her; at the most that it was but foretold what her fate would be while that race remained in a debased and depraved state, and brute force the governing power.

The next thing in course is, that man is the head and woman the heart of society, and consequently that she should be ruled by him. That man may in the present state of society have more brilliant intellectual endowments than woman, I am not disposed to question, but if such is the case, it is because of the many disabilities under which she labors, and the many prerogatives he enjoys. What though woman were not fully equal to the most brilliant masculine mind, does it prove that she should be disfranchised for that? If such is the case, it inevitably follows that all men who do not come above the most intellectual women must be disfranchised also. If it is to the highest intellectual capacity alone that government should be entrusted, then all but the *monarch mind* of the nation should be silent—all else should be ostracised. The political circle should be expurgated, not of inferior female minds only, but of those of the masculine bipeds also. Mind knows no sex. If the Rev. gentleman's principles are correct, let the mightiest mind in the nation be autocrat, and all the rest be in silence.

But the stress of his argument is not so much woman's intellectual inferiority, as that she has a heart, and would not press the iron heel of power upon offenders. That woman is the *heart* of society, no one who knows the laws on our statute books concerning her will deny. At all events, those laws are heartless enough to prove that those who made them have no hearts themselves. But I deny the whole of the Rev. gentleman's con-

clusions that the head and not the heart should rule. It should be just the reverse, or rather that the *head, guided by the heart*, should bear sway. How often are the most brilliant intellects prostituted to the basest purposes! How often are brilliancy and depravity united! Look into the political arena, and tell me if the heart is not the very thing that is wanted.

Our laws need *humanizing*—they have no balm for the unfortunate. The very laws themselves, in many cases, plant the seeds of vice and crime, and then proceed as heartlessly to punish those in whom they spring up and bear fruit, as though it was not the fruit of their own sowing. Justice should be tempered with mercy. The criminal is oftener the victim and consequence of pernicious customs and laws than otherwise, and consequently deserving of commiseration and pity. It is necessary that society should protect itself, but it is not necessary that unmingled vengeance should be dealt out. The object of all punishment should be to reform the vicious and make them good and useful members of society. But at present our prisons are but little better than colleges where villainy is taught, sending forth the most accomplished scoundrels who have here become qualified to receive the degree of A. M. in their profession. The whole difficulty in our penal code is, it lacks the *heart*. Nothing is done, or but very little at least, to reform the culprits; they are treated as outcasts of the race, and society puts its heel upon them; and in turn for "sowing the wind," instead of trying to ameliorate and elevate their condition, it "reaps the whirlwind."

I repeat it, what we want in our legislators is *heart*. It is now a great Sahara. We want it studded with beautiful, bright green oases, the better nature of mankind, which, like the dews of heaven, distil upon all around, refreshing and reinvigorating the downcast and unfortunate. The very thing we ought to feel when we come to deal out justice is, that the offender is our brother, our fellow-mortal, with like passions, weakness, frailties, and beset with like temptations, and that had we been placed in his circumstances, and with his organism, we should have done like him. In short, that we are human, and not impeccable beings.—"Let him that's without sin cast the first stone."—Vindictiveness and revenge are meet concomitants of justice among savage nations, but in this enlightened land they should give way to forgiveness and philanthropy. Love and Charity should be exercised towards transgressors. We should endeavor to raise the fallen, and make him feel that he is still a man, will be but wash off his pollution, and fully impress and teach

"Him while he lives,  
To know no bliss but that which virtue gives,  
And when he dies, to leave his lofty name  
A light, a landmark on the cliffs of fame."

The Rev. gentleman has given us a specimen of his discriminating sagacity in relation to my allusions to Poe and Mary Wolstoncraft; and says I inferred that because a man neglects to provide for his family, owing to dissipation, a woman has a right to dabble in the dirty puddle of politics.—Allow me to say the gentleman is more nice than wise, and totally misapprehended or misrepresents my argument. The substance of it was that it was just as excusable for a woman to neglect her business to take a part in the making of the laws, as for man to do so. And that many men do so, is sufficiently evident from the seedy condition of many of our professed politicians, who have yet to breathe

"In the bracing air  
Of toil—of temperance—of that high, rare  
Ethereal virtue, which alone can breathe  
Life, health and lustre unto Freedom's wroath."

I do not contend that it would be excusable for women to devote their whole time to politics—only that it would be no worse for them to do so than for men—for of all the detestable beings on earth, the professional politician is the lowest.—Truly, it requires different beings than these to

"Breathe  
Life, health and lustre unto Freedom's wroath."

None but those too lazy to work, or those of too little minds to comprehend how little man has to boast of at his best estate, will be forward to set themselves up as rulers of mankind. No; true worth wears the mantle of humility, and puts



itself forward only when duty requires it to do so to protect its own rights and those of others. And when they are secure, it again retires to private life. For the dirty puddle of politics, it has no affinity, any further than "duty points the way" as the means of correcting abuses, and ameliorating the condition of mankind.

But, seeing that the Rev. gentleman is so keen for reasoning on small things, let us look at one of his specimens of reasoning, *per saltum*, in his first speech. He inferred because Plato recommended that women should wrestle the same as man did, that his doctrine that she should be educated the same as he, and have the same rights, was fallacious. His reasoning is fully equal to what he puts into my mouth in inferring woman's right to vote from man's dissipation. Does the Rev. gentleman consider it any more proper for man to wrestle, as was the practice then, than for woman. Plato as much advocated men's wrestling as he did woman's, and so, according to the Rev. gentleman's reasoning, it should be inferred that men should have no political education and rights, for, forsooth, Plato advocated their wrestling naked! It is not to be wondered that one who is such an able logician should sneer at heathen's doctrines when they come in contact with their own prejudices. He that simply gives us "He shall rule over thee, and is

"To insipid to seek  
One grace of meaning for the things he speaks,"  
in defence of

"Truths too heavenly to be understood,"  
and

"Who, bolder even than Nemrod, thinks to rise,  
By nonsense heaped on nonsense to the skies;"  
Is just the one from whom we might expect to hear

"Dark, tangled doctrines,  
Which simple votaries shall on trust receive;"  
Were dictatorial, pompous assumptions, without deigning to give a wherefore, but simply sneering at everything that runs counter to their preconceived notions.

What chance the Rev. gentleman wishes to know, would woman stand against man, were she to demand the supply of her needs and protection by right? Truly, what chance would she have where brute force is the ruling power? It is not in such situations that it is expected her rights will be guaranteed to her. No; it is where other arguments than physical strength can be appreciated that we expect this. And the day is already approaching when Right will triumph over Might, and she will be permitted to take her proper position in society—to fill the sphere to which her nature adapts her. The last arguments to which Tyrants resort, brute force, has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

History's "dark ages" sands,  
With her are nearly run.  
'Tis orient sky, already stands  
A bright, refulgent sun."

The Millennium dawns upon us when the lamb and the lion shall lie down together—when the wishes of the feeblest woman, made known in words of love, shall be as much respected as the thundering commands of a Hercules. Were the people of earth to ever remain what the Rev. Gentleman appears to presuppose, tigers and hyenas, of course it would be useless to attempt to elevate woman, for brute force would keep her down; but thanks to the great Superintendent of the Universe, the Spirit of Progression is abroad. And as well might bigots attempt to chain the lightnings of heaven, as to prevent society from moving forward. They may stand still and serve as mile-stones along the road of Progression, showing how far we have gone past them, (which is all they are good for,) but they cannot prevent the trade-winds of reform from wafting the Ship of State along. Though it may lay at anchor for a season, yet as fast as soundings can be taken and the correct channel ascertained, a bold crew mounts the ship, weighs anchor, and is off to the confines of the waters newly explored. Here

she may anchor again, but it will be but to soon unmoor and make another advance after making the necessary surveys.

And in conclusion let me say to those who oppose the just and equal rights of woman, that they are as short-sighted as they are selfish. The elevation of woman cannot but react favorably, and in turn, prove blessing to man. Every chain with which he fetters her is but one his blindness, forges for himself. Deriving his being and early culture from her, if her views are enlarged and noble the same will be impressed upon his plastic mind. But if, on the other hand, she has been degraded, she will impress upon him groveling and base thoughts and passions.

"As the twig is bent the tree's inclined."

You might as well attempt to raise a forest of lofty oaks and pines on the *barrens* in the far West, as to look for a race of noble, high-souled men from dwarfed, stunted mothers. Glance your eye over history: where do you find the most noble men, but where women are most elevated? Of the ancients, perhaps the Spartans and Lycians paid more respect to woman than most other nations. The former, we know, paid more attention to the training of their women, and Herodotus affirms of the Lycians, that children took the name of their mother, and took their condition, bondage of freedom from her, instead of as among other nations, from the father. The courage and bravery of the Spartans was proverbial; and Homer calls the Lycians among the defenders of Troy,

"The best and bravest of the hostile force,"

Indeed, were I called upon to devise the most effectual means for elevating the race, I should say elevate woman—*enrich the soil in which it must grow, if you would have a luxuriant crop of humanity.* She is the Archimedian lever with which to raise the social world. For men to attempt to degrade woman is suicidal, and none but the blind votaries of prejudice and grey-headed custom, and those who wish to make themselves appear large by belittling woman, will be guilty of attempting to keep her down.

For the edification of those who can find nothing in the Bible concerning woman, but "He shall rule over thee," and St. Paul's commands for wives to submit to their husbands, I will give a part of the wise man's description of a "virtuous woman." "Her price is far above rubies. The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her, so that he shall have no need of spoil. She will do him good, and not evil, all the days of her life.— \* \* \* Strength and honor are her clothing, and she shall rejoice in time to come.— She openeth her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue is the law of kindness. She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness. Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband, also, and he praiseth her." Truly, a woman in whom "the heart of her husband doth safely trust"—who "doeth him good and not evil, all the days of her life," and "openeth her mouth with wisdom," and whom her husband "praiseth," is a fit subject for commands and submission. People who are not a "law unto themselves," are the ones that acquire to be ruled—not those who "rule their own souls," and are "better than he that taketh a city."

To throw the whole matter into a nutshell, in conclusion, the sex should not be taken into consideration in devising the means to protect the lives and property of mankind, because wrong tramples upon all without regard to sex.

## THE LILY.

RICHMOND, IND. OCTOBER 1, 1855.

### Greeting to our Friends.

Seated in the Lily sanctum again, the thread of pleasant communion between ourself and numerous readers seems again resumed, and we turn to the warm friendship proffered to us by so many, with renewed esteem. The dark cloud about us seems softened with love-rays, and now that the one who through all our life has given us the truest and the purest and the holiest love human affections know, has passed to her eternal reward, we feel like a child to gather up all the shreds of friendship which have indeed thickly flocked our pathway, to horde them as soul treasures, to make us strong for the future. How can we estimate rightly these hallowing influences of life? How can we justly appreciate the happiness that flows to us from the binding ties of friends and of home and home relations. These joys are as the distilling dews coming to us quietly and unobtrusively in the shadowy night, binding up our heart-weariness, and soothing the heavy throes of suffering. Surely would we languish without them. A most munificent Creator has blessed us thus beyond all measure, filling our cups to overflowing with sweet comforts to the soul, for which we have but to turn our face truly to them, and they come to us as inspiration. They fill the heart with charity and kindly feeling, and out-gushing love. They come to us all equally who have the soul-needs, and teach us our individual duties that make us noble in truth's sight, as well as robe us in the sweet mantle of humility, so befitting us who are all dependent upon an Almighty arm for the breath, and a glorious future.

Feeling thus sensibly your kindness, we would add to the friendly bond between, by acknowledging its power. We feel still stronger to work for the redemption of home from its deep-rooted and insidious enemies, which have been man's inventions, one from all uncharitableness, and the other from perverted and sinful appetite. And thus with your aid, we will work on, keeping our armor bright, and our hope high, that eventually charity and godliness will cover the land, and the acknowledgment of individual supremacy, and the right of homes for protection from that which has destroyed so many, will lead peace to every habitation, and give every human being a proper estimate of the divine affections of the soul.

**Cutter's Anatomy, Physiology and Hygiene**, designed for colleges, academies and families, by Calvin Cutter, M. D. Human and Comparative Anatomy, Physiology and Hygiene, by Mrs. Eunice P. Cutter.

We acknowledge the receipt of a copy of each of these works from Dr. Cutter, and heartily award to them the high meed of praise their merits so richly demand. Deeply important as are these subjects to every one, they are but rising in importance, and their bearing upon our every day life is not generally appreciated; therefore, these works are especially valuable on account of their pointed and practical mode of elucidation. Especially are we pleased with the smaller work, by Mrs. Cutter, arranged in an attractive manner for the use of the younger pupils.



Dr. Cutter visited Richmond during the session of the Teacher's Institute, and endeared himself to many by his excellent feeling and his practical lecturing.

These volumes are recommended by the Indiana State Board of Education, and are for sale by James Elder at the Post Office Bookstore, Richmond, Ind.

**MEDICAL EDUCATION OF WOMEN.**—Miss Anna Inman, a member of the New England Female College at Boston, is now in this city for the purpose of endeavoring to raise funds to extend the educational resources and usefulness of that excellent institution. The State of Massachusetts has made a grant of \$10,000 to the college, on condition that its friends shall furnish as much more; and to induce subscriptions from abroad, the Trustees give to every donor of \$100 the right to have a pupil instructed free of charge. We trust Miss Inman may not be entirely unsuccessful in her efforts here.

We are glad to notice the above in the New York Tribune, it being, we believe, the donation by a State for the establishment of any kind of a college for woman. And we are gratified to see the quick answering zeal of woman for her benefit, and through her every family, and through the family, the whole race.

ADALINE FRAYER has our thanks, and in reply to her inquiry, say that subscribers can have their papers commence at any date they name.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

COUNCIL BLUFFS, Iowa, Aug. 30, 1855.

I hoped, by this time, to have a good report to make in regard to the workings of the prohibitory liquor law of this State—which was passed last winter and went into operation the first of July. But whatever may have been done in other sections, I am sorry to say that so far as our city is concerned, it amounts to nothing. Notwithstanding the passage of such a law, our merchants and saloon keepers brought on a full supply of liquors, and have been as actively and openly engaged in their sale as though the law had not pronounced it a criminal business, and imposed fines and imprisonment on both the seller and the drinker. Only one case has been tried under the law, and that proved a failure. Though positive proof of sale was produced, the jury returned a verdict of "not guilty," and the criminal was discharged. And there the matter rests. Men say it is useless to enter complaints—for though the justices are temperance men, the constables are not; and as these latter have the summoning of juries there is no hope that any will be chosen to sit on a trial for violation of the liquor law, except the hangers-on of grog-shops—and from whom there is no hope of conviction, even if the proof of guilt be positive and undeniable. And so they have abandoned the field, leaving the rum-seller in full possession, to pursue his work unmolested.

Temperance men have not courage, or do not deem it desirable to enforce the seizure principle, or to arrest intoxicated persons. Search for liquors would be unnecessary, as they are boldly exposed for sale upon the shelves, and men unblushingly pour out and drink the poison in full

view of the passer-by—there being no screens, as at the east, to conceal the dark doings within.

How long this state of things will continue it is impossible to say; but I trust not long. Things are improving; public sentiment is becoming more healthy than heretofore, and the additions that are being constantly made to our population by the better class of people from the East, will tend to elevate us as a community, morally, socially, religiously and intellectually.

I have hoped that some of the *Lily* readers in the eastern part of this State would report through its columns something in relation to the success of the law in their different localities—but as yet I have seen nothing. I am assured, however, by travelers who come through, that it is quite generally observed, and that in many places no liquor can be obtained. I hope this is true, and that the same influence that operates farther east to make them an order-loving and law-abiding people, may speedily extend to our city—and even go beyond into Nebraska, where the law is equally disregarded.

The greatest deprivations we suffer here are social and intellectual advantages. For these, or especially for the latter, we must wait the laying off a railroad across the State; then I trust those who serve up rich intellectual feasts at the East will favor us with their presence, and incite a taste for such entertainments among our people.

Some of my friends are writing me letters of sympathy, thinking I must be very lonely in my far away, western home. Such letters are truly welcome, for they assure me my memory still lives, not only with those familiar friends whom I have met face to face, but is also enshrined in the hearts of many of my stranger friends, with whom I have for years held frequent and familiar spirit converse, through the medium of *The Lily*. But never do I so keenly feel my isolation from the loved friends and kindred spirits with whom I so pleasantly spent the hours in other days, as after reading those friendly missives. They take me back to the old home and old scenes—they remind me of all I have gone through, the much I have labored, and the much that has been accomplished since my labors commenced. They bring before me the noble band who have fearlessly braved public opinion, and dared to plead for the rights of humanity—some of whom I still see with harness on, while others in retirement from the more active labors are watching with intense interest the progress of the cause. Among this latter class I number myself—and I also mention our good sister C. J. H. Nichols, who has found a home on the lovely prairies of Kansas.

But I would not have my friends think of me as sad and lonely in my chosen retreat—for I really am not. Some sad hours I have had, when tho't went back to my dear cottage home and the friends I have left behind, and I have then sighed—not to return—but that I ever wandered away. But such feelings speedily pass away, and I am happy and contented in my bluff-bound home. I meet few who are interested in our reform movements, still I have a circle of intelligent, agreeable acquaintances, whose society compensates in a great measure for that I have lost, and serves to while away the time very pleasantly.

Household duties, and the cultivation of vegetables, trees and flowers, fill up the time hitherto devoted to *The Lily*. Though deprived of the reading of many of my favorite exchanges, we still have a goodly number of monthly and semi-

monthly, weekly and semi-weekly publications, which keep us posted on all the important news of the day, both as relates to the East and the West. Of western papers the "*Herald of Freedom*," published at Lawrence, Kansas, is most deeply interesting on all that pertains to that territory, and especially to the exciting, disgraceful scenes enacted on its soil by the border ruffians of Missouri. It is a large sheet, neatly printed on clear white paper and filled with choice reading. Its editor, G. W. Brown, is an able writer, and an earnest and fearless champion of freedom. He has received all manner of threats and intimidations from the pro-slavery dictators of Missouri, but he nobly dares them to lay violent hands either on his person or his press—boldly warning them that he is prepared to sell life and the liberty of free speech dearly. A few more such spirits in Kansas, and the ruffians who now control it would be willing to stay on their own side of the Missouri, and leave the citizens of the territory to manage their own affairs. I would bespeak for the *Herald* the attention of the friends of freedom everywhere. Its publishers have made large sacrifices to carry forward the enterprise, and they can only be sustained in it by a large subscription list. Those who would see freedom triumph over slavery should cheer them on in their noble work, by contributing the material aid necessary to that object. Terms of the paper, two dollars a year, in advance.

The time for the National Woman's Rights Convention draws nigh, as also that of the Indiana Woman's Rights Association. I trust many of my readers, especially those of the west, will enjoy the rich treat then to be served up. It would do my heart good to be with them on those occasions, to cheer and to be cheered, by a reunion of kindred spirits; but the distance is too great—the journey too tedious a one for me, and I must be content with a newspaper report of the proceedings. I shall be there in spirit, and I can in imagination see the crowd gathered round—the sea of upturned faces, eagerly catching the words of truth, whose eloquent utterings are familiar to my ears. I pray that no disturbing influence may be present, but all may redound to the glory and advancement of Woman's cause.

A. B.

P. S.—We are now enjoying some of the luscious wild fruits of the west. Plums in abundance are now in market, at fifty cents a bushel, which almost rivals the tame plums of the east. They fully equal the latter in size, and I sometimes think the flavor is equally rich. We have also apples and peaches in market, but unfortunately they are not the product of this country—they grow on the slave soil of Missouri and are brought here in wagons a distance of about two hundred miles.—Apples retail in our streets at \$2.50 per bushel, or twenty-five cents per dozen. Peaches bring \$4.00 per bushel.

For *The Lily*.

#### Theology and Ethics.—No. 3.

The Unfitness of Things.

BY MRS. JANE FROHOCK.

Happily for mankind the day has gone by when winds and storms were regarded as the varied manifestations of displeased, and infuriated deities, clashing the elements in their revengeful strife,—when earthquakes and volcanic eruptions were the visible openings to those infernal regions, where, by eternal torture, they satiated their wrath upon offending mortals.



great gods, with their demoniac agencies far back in the lower planes of thought, while science has solved the once mysterious problem of nature's supposed unfitness physically, and demonstrated the harmonious tendency of those inherent laws that guide and govern all things throughout their never-ceasing, yet ever-progressive changes.—Truly "fear is the shadow of ignorance;" for man's

The mighty march of mind has left those belligerence in nature's God has ever been in proportion to his knowledge of man's laws. Although science has dispelled man's fears with regard to nature's material arrangement; yet, he still fears the result of the supposed unfitness of man morally and mentally. Nature as a whole includes both matter and mind,—the external form, and the internal motor. United and adapted each to the other, they make up the universal mechanism, which must be investigated upon general principles. But so long as we reason from mere superficial appearances, and localize our investigations, we cannot perceive the fitness of any isolated portion; because we do not view its connection with the great whole. Our great error in judging of mental and moral unfitness, consists in disconnecting humanity from its surroundings.

If, according to geological science, nature physically is in a state of development; humanity as a part of nature must, both physically and mentally, be subject to the same law. In proof that this is the case, there is nothing from which the mind can gain the first conception of a state of absolute fixedness. The idea is as incomprehensible as the limits of time or space. Hence we infer, that if that part of the universal mechanism within reach of our investigation, is constantly progressing from germination to maturity, all must, according to the same fixed law, be moving on towards completion, otherwise there would be no adaptation of parts, or harmony as a whole.

Humanity therefore is not yet perfected; for how can it be, while its ever-changing elements are derived from the no less changing materials with which it is connected. There must likewise be a correspondence between the bodily organs, especially the organs of sense; and the sensations through which the mind receives its mental sustenance.—Whether gross or refined they must both be on the same plane; for man's powers of appreciation can never exceed his highest conceptions. The limit of every man's mind is his ideal embodiment of perfection. His highest conceptions of wisdom, power, and goodness being his standard of right, his appreciation of those attributes will always be in accordance with his plane of mentality; for his practical righteousness can never exceed his highest conceptions of right, whether he be virtuous or vicious, gross or refined. For every man's power of perception being his stand point, from which he views things, and reasons of their properties, it is as impossible for him to appreciate beyond this power, as for a man at the base of a mountain to see things from its summit.

Animality is the lowest plane of thought.—Hence self is the great centre around which all the mind's faculties revolve, yet man on this plane is governed by the same laws that govern all humanity. If his channels of thought be unrefined, his thoughts can no more be refined than a rough mould can produce a smooth casting.

His mental qualities correspond with his organs of thought, upon the same principle that crabapple receives its qualities from the peculiar organization of the tree that produces it. The elements of mental food characterize the mental organism upon the same principle that physical food characterizes the physical organism; because the organs of both are built up of the elements incorporated into them, consequently they must adapt themselves to the elements by which they are nourished.

It has been demonstrated that when certain elements are exhausted in the soil, the organism of subsequent vegetation must be different, to be adapted to the elements remaining. This must be so, it is a law of nature and is as applicable to mind, as to plant or animal. History too, proves that the products of mind the world over, have ever been characterized by man's mental food.—Hence we infer, that if every organism is characterized by its constituent elements, and the pro-

ducts of every organism are characterized by the organism, an improvement in those products can only be effected by higher elements, that is, by superior nutriment, a more refined cultivation.—This key unlocks many of the mysteries of mental and moral imperfections, and is highly suggestive as to what mankind needs.

(To be continued.)

Mt. Carroll, Ill., Sept. 15th, 1855.

For The Lily.

#### A BIRTHDAY'S SOLILOQUY.

Another fleet year,  
Like a smile or a tear,  
Has passed from the worn face of time,  
And faded away  
Like the clouds of to-day,  
The rain-bow in grandeur sublime.

The moments have flown,  
And lie withered and strown,  
Like leaves when the autumn winds sigh,  
The pleasures of earth,  
With its joys and its mirth,  
Are born but to pass and to die.

In vain we would moor  
Our frail bark on life's shore;  
The tide bears us speedily on,  
We hasten away,  
And the joys of to-day  
Like shadows flit by and are gone.

Time's dark rolling tide  
Turneth never aside,  
To lengthen the bright golden hours,  
Nor stops by the way,  
Where the morning-light play,  
To gather the loveliest flowers.

O, life is a boon  
That seems ever too soon  
To haste from this beautiful sphere;  
Old time bears us on,  
Like a dream, life is gone,  
Exchanged for the pall and the bier.

But let us resign  
Since our father divine  
A kindly assurance has given,  
Of life in the skies,  
Where the time never flies—  
A home everlasting in heav'n.

Salem, Iowa, Sept. 1855.

D. G. M.

For The Lily.

#### THE FUTURE.

HIRAM, September 18th, 1855.

Dr. Buchanan says, "It is a good thing to live in the nineteenth century, but better still would it be to live in the twenty-fifth, for this century is but the starting to new life, while the twenty-fifth will be compared to it, as the noontide light, to the faint glimmering of twilight." If the great spirit of reform which seems almost to have had its birth in the incoming of the present century goes on with its present increasing velocity, for six centuries to come, it would indeed be a blessed, a joyful privilege, to look forth upon this world renovated, and redeemed from the blight, and mildew which now covers it; but would it not be a greater privilege to be instrumental in bringing on this millennial day. Are we ever so happy, indeed; do we know any thing of true happiness only as we live in such a manner as to develop our true natures, and fulfil our earthly mission? Are we not all links in the great chain that commercial with the first aspirations of an immortal soul, and extends onward; and onward through the endless cycles of eternity. Upward, and upward still, should be the tendency of that chain, and every individual has a work to perform. Each finishes his portion of the work and leaves it either well, or ill done. But it is his portion only that is done, the next takes up the glorious task, and goes on with the unfinished superstructure, where his brother left it. Different periods in the history of society may

call to different fields of labor, but in every period, to make the great family of man wiser, better, and therefore happier, should be the great business of life. The demands of the present age are peculiarly imperative. The cries of the crushed masses for help, for justice, for life, can no longer be stifled. The slave, from his dismal rice swamp, is calling aloud for justice, and for the rights which are his as a man, and an heir of immortality.—The operative from the work-shop, who is scarcely less a slave, is claiming loudly for his share of the land which the great father intended as the rightful heritage of every one of earth's children, that he may no longer be vacillating between starving, stealing, or the alms-house. The drunkard who is the slave of the rum-seller, who is crushing out both soul and body, is, in his lucid moments pleading with us to break the horrid chains that bind him; by removing the monster, alcohol, from the land. The starving millions in our own land are urging their claims to a pittance of the billions of acres of unsold lands that are now in the hands of the government.—Every where, the cries of the crushed millions salute our ears. They have been heard in our little community, and I trust not heard in vain. By the earnest effort of the friends of reform, the tide of intemperance has been checked here, and we trust it will never again roll back upon us. The subject of equal rights is claiming a share of attention. Last Tuesday evening after a spirited temperance meeting, the attention of the audience was called to the propriety of co-operating with the convention to be holden in Cincinnati in October next. Alvah Udall was called to the chair. A very good interest was manifested, and it was proposed to send five delegates to the convention. Dr. L. W. Trask, Alvah Udall, Mrs. Catherine Young, Mrs. Sarah Lane and Miss Sarah Udall, were appointed said delegates. After some general remarks as to the great importance of the Equal Rights movements, the meeting adjourned.

SARAH UDALL, Sec'y.

#### Indiana Woman's Rights Meeting.

The Annual Meeting of the Indiana Woman's Rights Association will convene in Indianapolis, on the 22d and 23d of October next.

EMI B. SWANK, Pres't.

MARY B. BIRDSALL, Sec.

#### National Woman's Rights Convention.

In accordance with a vote of the National Woman's Rights Convention, at Philadelphia, in October last, the next Convention will be held in Cincinnati, Ohio, on the 17th and 18th of October next.

In behalf of the Central Committee,

PAULINE W. DAVIS, Pres't.

LUCY STONE BLACKWELL, Sec'y.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

Sam. Anderson, Selucie Forbes, Wm. S. Heacock, M. E. Richmond, Emi B. Swank, Mary F. Thomas; Lucy R. Freeman, Margaret Rinehart, Catherine Tracy, Almira McLaughlin, Betsey P. Barker, Sarah Emily Lewis, M. E. Branson, J. Nell Williams, E. J. Hall, Fannie Glasier, Joseph Freeman, Sylvia A. Crippen, E. P. F. Bradner, Daniel Smoke, W. S. Heacock, Charlotte F. Miller, Hannah Plumley, Levonia Parker, Emeline M. Jones, Adaline T. Swift, Q. L. McCauley, E. Beardsley, Adaline Frayer, R. M. Sanford, E. B. Place, Betsey Ann Hoyt, Emma C. Card, Augusta S. Bowe, Lucretia H. Eddy, Mrs. Fox and Mrs. Morse, Sophia Robinson, J. C. Whitehead, S. B. Snodde, H. Richards, G. W. Knapp, E. Ellis, D. G. Mendenhall.